

Draft Individual Review Form

Proposal number: 2001-I204-1

Short Proposal Title: Watershed Education Project

1a) Are the objectives and hypotheses clearly stated?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Funds staff for ongoing program. How different?

1b1) Does the conceptual model clearly explain the underlying basis for the proposed work?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Science-based. Connected to Adopt-a-Watershed.

1b2) Is the approach well designed and appropriate for meeting the objectives of the project?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

How the program differs from past programs not clear --

1c1) Has the applicant justified the selection of research, pilot or demonstration project, or a full-scale implementation project?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

There is merit in funding a continuing program, but the proposal does not explain how many teachers to be involved...plus, linkages from the past. Many years of funding efforts.

1c2) Is the project likely to generate information that can be used to inform future decision making?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

This group should be able to explain and help out a lot of other groups – all these programs should be SHARING with each other --

2a) Are the monitoring and information assessment plans adequate to assess the outcome of the project?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Hard to tell in the proposal outline.

2b) Are data collection, data management, data analysis, and reporting plans well-described, scientifically sound and adequate to meet the proposed objectives?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Not applicable.

3) Is the proposed work likely to be technically feasible?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Not applicable.

4) Is the proposed project team qualified to efficiently and effectively implement the proposed project?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Insufficient information to evaluate.

Miscellaneous comments

[Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Overview:

This project proposal would fund a coordinator for an on-going program associated with the Adopt-a- Watershed program area in Butte County.

Positive Aspects:

- continues a successful science-based environmental education program adapted for the region.
- proposes to expand the program within the established network of trained teachers.
- provides for continued field study and restoration efforts

Negative Aspects:

- primary allocation of funds is for a coordinator and other staff.
- does not describe the scope of the positions to be established in other districts.
- does not describe the type of training to be offered by Adopt-a-Watershed and how this will be different than previously funded training...what would the funds pay for? stipends, materials, substitute pay???
- provides a large allocation for materials that should already be available or may be requested in another CAL-FED grant proposal calling for AAW training for the area.
- no indication how "outcomes" can be measured.

Reviewers Comments:

Although there is merit in funding continuing programs, this project should be reviewed by CAL-FED providers prior to extending additional funding. How many teachers are involved and how many are within the service area that want to be involved? This program has been in existence for some time, and has received funding from other sources. What are the linkages? How have these efforts made any impact? What is the scope of work provided by the coordinator and those funded by service contracts? The budget is not detailed enough to clearly understand what kind of training will take place and how the "action" projects will compliment classroom learning.

**Overall Evaluation
Summary Rating**

- ☐ Excellent
- ☐ Very Good
- ☐ Good
- ☒ Fair
- ☐ Poor

Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating

[Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]